

White Paper on the Future of the PhD in the Humanities

December 2013



McGill



Social Sciences and Humanities
Research Council of Canada

Conseil de recherches en
sciences humaines du Canada

Canada

White Paper on the Future of the PhD in the Humanities¹

Executive Summary

In this white paper, we report on the chronic problem of humanities PhD academic underemployment, develop an argument for the social value of high-level humanities research and teaching, and outline a series of measures for the reform of the PhD in the humanities. We note that most recent thinking about humanities graduate study has focused on the institution of the academy and the academic labour market. While we agree that these are significant focal points, we nevertheless maintain that it is important to develop a wider viewpoint that sees the university as a participant in the political world.

An examination of recent studies leads to the conclusion that as many as 50% of those who enter PhD programs do not complete, and that those who do complete take seven years on average (in Canada) to fulfill all the requirements for the degree. Of those who do receive the degree, only about 20%-30% secure positions in colleges and universities. The evidence tells us that there is a systemic impossibility of achieving anything close to reasonable rates of permanent academic employment for humanities PhDs. The situation has been exacerbated by a tendency toward greater casualization of labour in higher education; however, it was not caused by the growth of sessional teaching and it will not be corrected by the eradication of such teaching.

We argue that the world of the 21st century needs high quality humanities research and teaching now more than ever. The need has to do with the undergraduate education of tens of thousands of young Canadians each year. It also has to do with how the kinds of knowledge borne of the humanities can contribute to clearer, more historically informed, and more ethical understandings of problems that face modern Canada.

Accordingly, we do not recommend cutting numbers of PhD students or cutting programs. Instead we recommend changing the PhD programs themselves, reforming doctoral training so that it leads to a multiplicity of career paths instead of only one. To consider the intellectual gifts, work ethic, deep learning, and high-level skills of PhD candidates is to recognize the wisdom of maintaining and reforming the PhD programs that prepare such people for their working lives in Canadian society.

We suggest that new PhD programs should be reoriented toward active participation in the world, should promote collaborative and interdisciplinary research, and should develop new kinds of teaching, research, and research deliverables—websites, film, editions, translations, and so on, in addition to books and articles. We recommend replacing the PhD dissertation with a coherent ensemble of scholarly projects. We offer two new model PhD programs—the Workshop PhD and the PhD in Applied Humanities.

We conclude with seven recommendations. These address the following areas of concern:

1. Mentorship
2. The PhD Dissertation
3. Professionalization and Time to Completion
4. New Scholarly Technologies
5. Recruitment
6. The Labour Market and the Culture of the Academy
7. Reporting

¹ This essay is the product of the Future of Graduate Training in the Humanities Project, funded by a Knowledge Synthesis Grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC), Canada. **Cite this publication in the following format:** *White Paper on the Future of the PhD in the Humanities*. Institute for the Public Life of Arts and Ideas, McGill University. December 2013.

1. Introduction

In what follows, we report on a chronic problem facing the modern university and we think about how to transform that problem into an opportunity. The problem is largely of the university's own making, so it is mostly but not exclusively within the power of faculty, students, and university leaders to solve it. The subject of our study is the state of graduate education in the humanities. Our focus is the PhD—it is and is thought to be a degree that qualifies graduates for professional careers—but the information about humanities graduate education that we present and our thinking about how to change the PhD have a bearing also on humanities education at the Masters level.

Each year talented, hard-working, and highly motivated young people enter humanities PhD programs in Canada and the USA. The competition to get into the programs, especially the top-ranked ones, is intense. Most of those who are admitted believe that the doctoral programs they enter are designed to lead to permanent academic employment. Of course, everyone—students and faculty—knows how difficult the job market is, but somehow most faculty and students manage to tune out information about the dire prospects for academic employment. Students might think that the statistics apply to others but somehow not to them. Students and their supervisors might imagine the barriers to entry as something like challenges to be overcome by dint of high-quality publication, strategic interdisciplinary training, effective networking, sheer persistence at the level of sessional teaching, and so on.

Indeed, these are not necessarily ineffective approaches to the academic job market. In the larger picture, however, as many as 50% of those who enter PhD programs do not complete, and those who do complete take seven years on average (in Canada) to fulfill all the requirements for the degree. Of those who do receive the degree, only about 20%-30% secure positions in colleges and universities. The evidence tells us that there is a systemic impossibility of achieving anything close to reasonable rates of permanent academic employment for humanities PhDs. In our view, it degrades the academic institution of the humanities that gifted younger scholars devote a large part of their lives preparing for tenure-track positions that do not exist.

The problem is institutional, but it is also social. In 2010, 27% of Canadians had university degrees (up from 18% in 1998).² University graduates are more active citizens than their less well-educated counterparts. They contribute significantly to innovation, productivity, and the economic performance of the nation.³ To continue and to expand the foundational work of educating Canadians, universities need the energy, originality, and critical acumen of first-class younger scholars. In addition to the value of their own teaching and research, and apart from the fact that a percentage of today's graduate students will become the faculty of tomorrow, doctoral students foster the effectiveness and productivity of the university by virtue of their ability to challenge and

² Conference Board of Canada, <http://www.conferenceboard.ca/hcp/details/education/university-completion.aspx>, accessed December 4 2013.

³ Ibid. A 2013 American survey found that 95% of employers surveyed said that they prefer to hire college graduates with “skills that will enable them to contribute to innovation in the workplace,” and 74% would recommend a liberal education to young people they know as the best way to prepare for success in today's global economy.” See *IT TAKES MORE THAN A MAJOR: Employer Priorities for College Learning and Student Success*, http://www.aacu.org/leap/documents/2013_EmployerSurvey.pdf, accessed December 4 2013.

change the state of present-day knowledge. Humanities PhDs develop respect for fact, a sense of history, the capacity for deep inquiry, critical reading skills, independent judgment, the ability to formulate new understandings of complex bodies of information, and the know-how to put pressure on the established thinking of the present-day academy.

We argue that the world of the 21st century needs high quality humanities research and teaching now more than ever. The need has to do with the undergraduate education of tens of thousands of young Canadians each year.⁴ It also has to do with how the kinds of knowledge borne of the humanities can contribute to clearer, more historically informed, and more ethical understandings of problems that face modern society.

There are those who would maintain that the STEM disciplines have far more to offer than have disciplines such as ancient languages, history, literary studies, art history, political science, or philosophy, especially to a world facing global warming, shortages of food and water, and unequal access to resources and opportunities. We argue that the humanities foster understanding across lines of national, ethnic, racial, and gender difference, which is an urgent requirement in an increasingly global world. To take one central example, critical humanities work has been foundational for the advances made by women over at least the past sixty years.⁵ The humanities make it possible to address—critically and historically—first-order questions about value, justice, ethical practice, and the principles of human dignity that must guide policy decisions and technological development and implementation.

In more immediate terms, there are those who would argue that Economics, Management, and Engineering are the kinds of majors that ensure students their first job and a jumpstart on a successful career. We argue that the careers of the future call for people who can think both deeply and flexibly, write persuasively, and question productively.⁶ A Canadian Chamber of Commerce report noted that employers want universities to teach students the so-called “soft skills”—abilities to communicate, collaborate, problem-solve, and so on.⁷ A recent American survey found that employers rated communication and problem-solving skills ahead of a range of kinds of technical training.⁸

In general, the disciplines of the humanities differ from the STEM disciplines because they share a focus on what people do and have done with the world and with each other and how they make and have made the world meaningful.⁹ The humanities differ from the Social Sciences in large measure because they do not focus on human actions and creations as if they could be analyzed or calculated with complete objectivity—seen from the outside as if we could stand quite apart from the actions and creations we study. Humanities knowledge is fundamentally dialogical.

⁴ See <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/81-582-x/2009002/tbl/d.2.8.2-eng.htm>, accessed December 3 2013.

⁵ *Le Deuxième Sexe* (1949), by Simone de Beauvoir, is one of starting points for second-wave feminism.

⁶ See, for example, <https://www.openforum.com/articles/why-english-majors-are-the-hot-new-hires/>, accessed December 5 2013.

⁷ “Upskilling the Workforce: Employer-sponsored Training and Resolving the Skills Gap” (October 2013), <http://www.chamber.ca/publications/reports/>, accessed December 2 2013.

⁸ “The Skills and Qualities Employers Want in Their Class of 2013 Recruits,” <http://www.nacweb.org/s10242012/skills-abilities-qualities-new-hires/>, accessed December 2 2013.

⁹ See, for example, “The Worth of the Humanities,” *Ameriquests* 9 (2012). <http://ejournals.library.vanderbilt.edu/index.php/ameriquests/article/view/3647>, accessed December 5 2013.

Humanities scholarship is well described as *reading*. Humanities researchers pay attention to objects of study in fine-grained detail. They think of objects of study as able to be drawn together, at least in principle, into an overall pattern or a coherent story. They develop accounts of cultural and political life that are mindful of history and are themselves oriented toward futurity—aware, that is, that knowledge is not definitive but is something always being made and therefore always open to critique. They treat what they study as able to speak back to them and therefore as a conversation partner rather than as mere object or raw data. Also, because humanities research is dialogical through and through, earlier studies are not, in principle, to be discarded; rather, earlier work remains active within what develops into widening dialogical work toward a deepened understanding of culture, society, and the political world.

Further, we contend that the humanities sustain people across their lifetimes, regenerating their willingness to ask questions, critique answers, pursue the pleasures and insights of a text, an image, or the sounds of a sonata; the humanities nurture the senses and the intellectual flexibility to imagine alternative futures. We make no claim for the superiority of the humanities over the STEM disciplines or the Social Sciences. We argue rather that all are necessary for the advancement and flourishing of people in the 21st century.

Our enabling assumption about the value of the humanities is fivefold:

- the humanities cultivate the capacity to think and imagine across national, religious, linguistic, ethnic, racial, gender, sexual, and cultural differences;
- the humanities enable a complex understanding of the present based on a knowledge of the past and a future-oriented awareness that knowledge is never something already made but rather something always in the making, earned by hard work, our own and the efforts of others;
- the humanities foster dialogical capacities to analyze and understand the products and actions of the human world (as opposed to the natural world)—ideas, the social and political life of discursive practices, works of art and literature, political movements, and historical events;
- the humanities develop a critical, historical, and case-based understanding of value that helps us determine why we should undertake certain courses of action in preference to others and why we should keep assaying the consequences of past events, formations, policies, and imaginings;
- the humanities create new worlds of ideas, art, and practice that are beautiful, pleasurable, and rewarding in themselves—able to nourish individuals and communities over time and also productive of alternative frames through which to understand the present and imagine different futures.

In addition to these core attributes, the humanities are valuable for modern society because they emphasize high-level research, interpretive, and communication skills. They teach reading of all kinds—deep reading of single texts and digitally enabled reading of hundreds of thousands of

texts, reading on stone, paper, and screen, and reading of fragment, image, and map. They demand careful reasoning and the analytical ability to account for the whole and the part. They foster the powers of imagination. They nurture the capacity to write and speak persuasively and informatively to different readerships and audiences. These are high-order skills that foster intellectual agility and effectiveness. At their best, they are skills that enable people to interpret the lessons of the past for the benefit of present and future generations, to understand other languages and cultures, to create new knowledge not only in fields of specialization but also across disciplines, to deal insightfully with questions in different fields of work, and to teach others high-order research, analytical, creative, and argumentative skills.

In what follows, we outline the challenges facing the humanities PhD. We develop recommendations that describe humanities PhD programs and humanities PhDs themselves, not as problems to be solved, but rather as sources of new thinking and of institutional and social advancement. We do not recommend cutting the numbers of graduate programs. Instead we recommend changing the programs. Most of the thinking about humanities graduate education over the past fifteen years has focused on the institution of the academy and the academic labour market.¹⁰ The institution and the market are important focal points, but they must not foreclose on the possibility of a wider angle of view that includes the political world. Whereas the institution and the market tend to be rule-bound spheres that reward a high level of conformity from participants, the polity is, in principle, the realm in which people are free to rethink and refashion the world in which they live. For philosopher Hannah Arendt, the political exists in advance of all the legal, administrative, commercial, and educational institutions that comprise the state; the political realm is created where people speak and act together freely and where they are capable of changing the way things are.¹¹

A political point of view allows us to see that universities are not in fact islands (or ivory towers), but are of a piece with the broader world; after all, Canadian universities are public institutions and have a responsibility to contribute to the advancement of the Canadian society. We believe that it is in the power of the university to transform the humanities PhD into a program able to train young scholars for a multiplicity of fulfilling careers, contribute formatively to the public good, and strengthen the academic institution of the humanities itself as a participant in the political world.

2. Challenges

Enrollments in PhD programs across Canada increased steadily over the latter part of the 20th century. A recent study indicated an increase of 450% since 1970. Though there are signs that rates may have reached a plateau in recent years, the humanities have remained more or less consistently in demand among prospective students.¹² As enrollments have increased, so too has

¹⁰ For a critical history of the controversy about humanities graduate education that is also exemplary of the institutional and market focus dominant in recent thinking, see Michael Bérubé, “The Humanities Unraveled,” *Chronicle of Higher Education*, February 18 2013, <http://chronicle.com/article/Humanities-Unraveled/137291/>, accessed December 5 2013.

¹¹ Hannah Arendt, *The Human Condition* (2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), 192ff.

¹² Marylin Rose, *Graduate Student Professional Development: A Survey with Recommendations*. SSHRC, March 2012;

the competition for admission. While precise rates of admission vary greatly between schools and among disciplines, a rough estimate suggests doctoral programs admit fewer than 3 out of every 10 applicants. Many programs receive more than 100 applications each year.¹³ These trends mark a considerable rate of expansion for doctoral programs, which have increased in size and number over the past many decades, as well as a concomitant rise in commitment to advanced graduate work on the part of the growing number of candidates and the universities that educate them.

PhD programs have expanded for a variety of reasons including, simply, the growing size of applicant pools. New programs and specializations have emerged in recent decades and social and economic drivers characteristic of emerging post-industrial environments create new pressures and problems and a need for new knowledge. Canadian universities have benefitted from an increase in federal and provincial funds to expand programs, motivated by the anticipated retirement of many older faculty members, an expanding undergraduate population (especially in Ontario), and a belief that an increasingly competitive and globalized economy requires more highly qualified personnel (HQP). “Sponsored research investments” more than doubled in the first decade of the 20th century and the additional funding available for student support has also likely made graduate study more attractive and more possible to larger numbers of students.¹⁴

Despite the sustained growth in interest in graduate work, PhD programs in the humanities have had a chronic problem with retention. Those who finish their programs invest a large part of their lives to do so. The average PhD candidate in the humanities in Canada now takes 6-7 years to complete the degree (the average is more than 9 years in the USA) and is usually in his or her mid-thirties at graduation.¹⁵ All PhD candidates have already completed a Bachelors degree and most (in Canada) have Masters degrees as well, meaning the average total time spent in postsecondary training is something like 12-13 years. This extended period of study means an increased debt-load for many and a significant loss of income for all who pursue it.

Indeed, so trying are the programs that 50% of students who enter the PhD in the humanities leave before completing the degree—a rate of attrition that is at least double that experienced by programs in the physical and life sciences.¹⁶ Relatively few students flunk out of grad school. Most who leave do so by their own choice. The reasons for that choice are many.

The stage of life during which most people pursue doctoral training corresponds with an important period of career development for others. (People who complete their formal education at the BA level have a decade or more of professional experience by their mid-thirties.) The same

Vicky Maldonado, Richard Wiggers, and Christine Arnold, *So You Want to Earn a PhD? The Attraction, Realities and Outcomes of Pursuing a Doctorate*. @ Issue Paper #15 Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario (April 13, 2013) <http://www.heqco.ca/SiteCollectionDocuments/At%20Issue%20Doctoral%20ENGLISH.pdf>

¹³ Based on informal data from McGill. See also stats from UBC--<https://www.grad.ubc.ca/about-us/graduate-education-analysis-research/admissions>.

¹⁴ Rose, 2012. See also Leonard Cassuto, “PhD Attrition: How Much is Too Much?” *Chronicle of Higher Education* (July 1, 2013); <https://chronicle.com/article/PhD-Attrition-How-Much-Is/140045/>. Cassuto also indicates a 50% rate of attrition.

¹⁵ Leo Charbonneau, “Is Canada Producing Too Many PhDs? Yes, No and Maybe.” *University Affairs* (November 30, 2011). Accessed August 7, 2013, <http://www.universityaffairs.ca/is-canada-producing-too-many-phds.aspx>; Charbonneau offers 33 as an average age at completion.

¹⁶ Maldonado et al., *So You Want to Earn a PhD?*

period also corresponds with principal child-rearing years (a consideration for students of both sexes). As time passes, graduate study can become an increasingly unsustainable financial and personal sacrifice for students. Poor supervisor-student relations, the often isolating nature of humanities research and writing, and alienation from one's home institution (students who move away from campus while writing their dissertations often for financial or family reasons can lose momentum) are also common reasons for non-completion. Graduate study can be stressful. A 2006 mental health report by the University of California acknowledged that graduate students are "a population at higher risk for mental health concerns. The level of stress for graduate students is magnified by their relative isolation from the broader components of campus life, the intense academic pressures of their advanced studies, and the increased presence of family and financial obligations."¹⁷

Undoubtedly, the realities of the academic job market can also contribute to students' decision to abandon their studies. As many as 86% of people entering doctoral programs in the humanities do so in pursuit of a career as a university professor, while only 20-30% of PhDs ultimately find permanent, full-time work in the academy. The half of PhD students who make it through face a tough road after graduation. While a good number of new PhDs may find initial positions within the academy, most of those are limited-term teaching jobs or postdoctoral fellowships. For most of the graduates, the offer of a tenure-track position never materializes. Increasingly, new PhDs are finding themselves accepting a series of underpaid, insecure, and institutionally liminal appointments: a less than stellar start to a career that required more than a decade of hard intellectual work.

Worse still, the number of available tenure-track positions is declining not increasing.¹⁸ Bottom-line strategizing about university hiring practices and priorities has resulted in major shifts in the balance of tenure-track and non-tenurable positions and has contributed to a casualization of labour in higher education. The often heavy teaching loads that come with sessional work make it difficult for new PhDs to keep up with the expectations to publish, so that the longer they stay in sessional or contract positions, the less likely they are to gain access to permanent, tenure-track employment.

Doctoral programs that regularly lose half their students before completion and ultimately see only 10-15% of the total incoming cohort achieve the principal goal for which the programs were designed in the first place must be acknowledged to be experiencing some level of systemic failure. The challenges facing the 21st-century university in this regard have to do principally with shifting 85-90% of doctoral scholars out of their role as sacrifices to the institutionalized culture of the humanities, rethinking degree programs so that they address the interests, talents, and legitimate career expectations of candidates, fulfilling the obligations of the university to the well-being of society, and advancing rather than eroding the core principles of the humanities.

¹⁷ Cited in Maldonado et al., *So You Want to Earn a PhD?*

¹⁸ Louise Desjardins, *Profile and Labour Market Outcomes of Doctoral Graduates from Ontario Universities* (Statistics Canada, 2012). Eighty-six percent of students entering humanities programs in Ontario planned to pursue academic work; the figure for those entering programs outside Ontario is 71%. Desjardins' conclusions are based largely on data from 2005. On placement rates see Rose, 2012, and Allison B. Sekuler, Barbara Crow and Robert B. Annan, *Beyond Labs and Libraries: Career Pathways for Doctoral Students* (Higher Education Quality Council of Ontario, 2013); the figures are a generalized average across all disciplines and are not specific to the humanities. Sekuler et al., 2013; referring to a 2009 US study.

The solution to this problem, in our view, is neither to reduce the numbers admitted to PhD programs nor to cut programs themselves.¹⁹ The truth, of course, is that not even the most robust academic system could absorb into the professoriate all the PhDs it produces. To do so would require that each professor train only enough students to fill his or her place: one PhD student per faculty member. As we have already argued, humanities PhD programs and the people who graduate from them represent a valuable resource for modern society. We argue therefore that the solution is not to cut programs but rather, first of all, to bring into the light the strong background assumption that the only future for a new PhD is a career as a university professor.

We can change our angle of view on the question of the “overproduction” of humanities PhDs by beginning to recognize that PhDs might be able to follow a multiplicity of career paths rather than only one. Indeed, the non-academic careers that PhDs do develop in reality seem to be remunerative, fulfilling, and worthwhile. While there is certainly not enough evidence available yet concerning the professional lives of PhDs working in non-academic jobs, what we do know suggests that they do not do poorly. A recent US study tells us that PhDs on average earn more, are less likely to suffer unemployment than people with BA or even MA degrees, and enjoy a reasonably high level of job satisfaction.²⁰

All this does not mean that humanities PhD programs are doing fine in spite of themselves. As already noted, up to 50% of candidates do not complete the degree. Those who do complete but do not secure academic jobs find themselves facing a period of bereavement and adjustment. While it appears that most ultimately do build satisfying careers, for many, if not most, the “failure” to find a tenure-track position comes as something of a surprise and can be professionally, socially, and emotionally harrowing. We also do not know if humanities PhDs are able to develop worthwhile non-academic careers because of or in spite of their doctoral training. Related to the shortcomings of the programs, the academic culture of the humanities, wedded to the idea that doctoral training equips students for academic careers only, has contributed to the widespread view, held even by new PhDs, that high-level humanities education makes people unfit for work outside the academy. The greatest challenge therefore has to do with changing the culture of the academy.²¹

¹⁹ Johns Hopkins University has just announced a plan to shrink its graduate programs significantly, allowing it to offer significantly better funding packages to the students they do admit and to “raise our yield.” The announcement was met with formal protest by current JHU students concerned about quality of education arguing that “a “critical mass” of graduate students is needed for meaningful work and discussions to take place.” Colleen Flaherty, “Shifts at Hopkins” *Inside Higher Ed* (December 11, 2013) <http://www.insidehighered.com/news/2013/12/11/hopkins-plans-shifts-graduate-school-and-faculty-hiring>.

²⁰ Georgetown Center for Education and the Workforce survey cited in Rose, 2012. The study does not, however, distinguish humanities PhDs from specialists in other disciplines. The 2006 Canadian Census confirms that PhDs earn more on average than people without PhDs.

²¹ An online community like Versatile PhD (<http://versatilephd.com/>) is helping to change the culture of the academy and the social character of the PhD. Other initiatives such as the MLA Task Force on Doctoral Study in Modern Language and Literature (http://www.mla.org/tf_doctoral), “Graduate Student Professional Development: A Survey with Recommendations” (see <http://www.cags.ca/publications.php>), a report prepared by Marilyn Rose for the Canadian Association for Graduate Studies in conjunction with the SSHRC (September 2012), and this White Paper are undertaking similar reform at the level of policy.

3. Highly Qualified Personnel

There were 176,945 people (of all ages) in Canada with earned doctorates at the time of the 2006 Census (the most recent for which relevant data is available online).²² This particular cohort of highly qualified personnel represents something less than 1% of the adult population of the country—a very small segment of that population, but one with evident talent and training and the capacity to make significant contributions in a wide range of fields.

A 2007 “profile of Canada’s highly qualified personnel” opens with the assertion that “Highly qualified human resources in science and technology are vital for economic growth. Both are dependent on the stock of human capital which supplies the labour market with highly skilled workers and helps in the diffusion of advanced knowledge.”²³ The brief profile makes no mention of people with humanities training among the stock of human capital. HQP are not only people with the ability to compete directly in the technology race. Nor are they only people with the learned ability to complete highly specialized *tasks*. HQP in the post-industrial, globalized, multicultural, and at times fragile professional ecosystem of the 21st century also includes those whose advanced knowledge is the product of humanities research and teaching.

Doctoral work in the humanities requires students to read widely, deeply and critically, to be able to summarize, adapt, apply, and engage with the scholarship with which they are in conversation in ways that are demanding and creative. Indeed, creativity is the core of all humanities research; humanities scholars must be able to see new ways to move among art works, archives, and ideas, to see what has not yet been seen, to develop new methodologies and theoretical models, to imagine something that has not yet been imagined. Despite the conventions imposed by the formalities of degree programs and institutionalized learning, there is much about the practice of humanities scholarship that is entrepreneurial.

The intellectual creativity and individuality required for innovative work is mirrored in the doctoral candidate’s ability to work independently and to develop techniques of self-governance. PhD candidates design and manage their own projects over a period of several years, define the purpose and goals of that work, review progress and question direction at intervals, develop feasible timelines and budgets (particularly where their research requires extended travel for archival or field work), and seek support for this work through effective applications to a range of funding agencies.

Humanities PhDs are capable communicators. The success of their work depends on their ability to speak and write persuasively for a range of audiences. The dissertation is usually several hundred pages of carefully composed prose, through which the author develops several interrelated lines of argument. While the dissertation itself might be written for a specialized

²² The same census data revealed that just under 3 million people had bachelors degrees and 866,975 people had masters degrees.

²³ Michael McKenzie, “A profile of Canada’s highly qualified personnel” in *Innovation and Analysis Bulletin* 9, no.2 (Statistics Canada, October 2007). SSHRC’s Talent funding program is designed to support the training of HQP “who will become leaders across campuses and communities, and thereby contribute to Canada’s success in the globalized 21st century.” http://www.sshrc-crsh.gc.ca/funding-financement/umbrella_programs-programme_cadre/talent-eng.aspx. Accessed 14 December 2013.

audience, the ability to employ sophisticated methodologies toward the articulation of a thesis has wide-ranging applicability. Along the way to completion, students present sections of their work in distilled form at seminars and conferences and often in lectures to undergraduate audiences. In each instance, they adjust the level of the presentation to suit the audience as well as the purpose. Likewise they publish sections of their doctoral work in competitive journals. Their applications for grant funding and other research support require them to craft arguments about the value of their work for non-specialist adjudication committees.

Teaching is one of the core skills of the humanities. Lecturing to undergraduate students is only one way in which PhDs teach. During their training most will work as teaching assistants to faculty members, developing their ability to share knowledge and new ways of understanding with others. Graduate student teaching assistants are also frequently undergraduates' primary source of counsel about the course (particularly if the course is large). Coaching junior students through writing assignments, classroom presentations, and exam preparation, and providing constructive critiques of that work when it is completed also provide excellent skills in leadership, mentoring, and effective critical engagement. PhD students who design and teach their own courses further hone their pedagogical techniques and abilities. In addition, by mentoring junior teaching assistants, they share what they have learned about teaching and begin to teach others how to teach.

The "tool kits" of PhDs, whether working within or outside the academy, remains largely the same: original, critical thinking, effective communication, creativity, empathy, innovation, problem-solving, project management, and leadership. What we propose here is therefore not a wholesale revision of the PhD nor a reorientation of its core principals. Rather, we advocate sharpening existing skills by making them more central to PhD training and adding additional competencies to reflect new ways of working. To the variety of shared and discipline-specific talents and proficiencies, we add enriched collaboration skills, greater interdisciplinary proficiency, a wider range of technology and media competencies, and a more robust, applied understanding of the public character and value of humanities scholarship.

The era of the solitary humanist is waning. The recent push toward collaborative, team-based research that reaches across academic networks and between academic and non-academic fields has begun to reorient humanities scholarship. The ambition, renewed collegiality, and vitality of projects with several or even dozens of researchers working in a range of related disciplines is invigorating and should serve as model for the training of new scholars. Just as students should be involved in major undertakings by senior academics, so too should they be encouraged to think about the collaborative possibilities for their own work. The team building among colleagues and partners as well as the requirements of major project management provide valuable experience whatever the students' professional futures. Networks that include researchers at all stages of their careers also create a robust system of mentorship with graduate students serving as mentors to undergraduates while also having the advantage of guidance from more senior scholars.

A diversified, outward-looking program of study will afford doctoral candidates a much fuller sense of the implications of their own work and of their field generally, and will help them establish a more vigorous and usefully active network of colleagues beyond the formal academy.

Finally, humanities scholarship has shied away from new technologies of investigation and dissemination. The quill and paper of centuries past have been transformed into laptop and laser printer but the final product—the book—has remained largely the same. There is particular talent and value in the ability to think through a complex problem, to persuade an audience of the importance of an argument, and to coax meaning out of text, image, or musical phrase with only the power of language. The tools at our disposal now are many though. Humanities scholars have happily adopted user-friendly digital research tools and archives, but few understand how they were created or how they work. It is not just research methods that have been affected by humanities computing. Collaboration, communication, publication and teaching are increasingly digitally based. New forms of scholarly communication require facility with new platforms, genres, and multimedia affordances. New methods of scholarly research require collaborative partners, from project managers to web designers to computer engineers. New curricular initiatives involve flipped classrooms, born-digital content, open-access online courses. If the reimagined PhD is to invite collaboration with other researchers and other sorts of institutions, so too should it invite and perhaps even require the development of meaningful understanding of and engagement with developing technologies of communication.

4. New PhDs for the 21st Century: Publicity, Collaboration, Fabrication The Workshop PhD and the PhD in Applied Humanities

Recent years have seen the development of add-on and/or after-the-PhD professionalization programs/associations such as Vitae (<http://www.vitae.ac.uk/>), Versatile PhD (<http://versatilephd.com/>), and Hook and Eye (<http://www.hookandeye.ca/>) as well as the growth of newly conceived PhD programs such as those in the Praxis Network (<http://praxis-network.org/>), where the emphasis is on Humanities Computing, or the Interdisciplinary Studies Graduate Program at the University of British Columbia (<http://isgp.ubc.ca/>). We seek to add to the work going forward, especially on program development, by outlining two model doctoral programs—the Workshop PhD and the PhD in Applied Humanities. Each brings forward what we believe are enabling features that belong in any doctoral program designed to lead to academic and non-academic career paths.

The features are

- publicity (the primary meaning of the word is “the condition of being public”)—a reorientation of graduate research and the forms of its production and publication to address multiple audiences inside and outside the academy and to enable students to participate actively in the life of the public;
- collaboration—the transformation of PhD programs to include collaborative forms of teaching, research, and publication. The ability to collaborate is much sought after in the non-academic labour market and increasingly important in academic teaching and research. While original, individual contributions to knowledge will remain the hallmark of high-level humanities research, the shift toward a greater degree of collaboration reflects well the essentially collaborative character of all kinds of learning. In many instances, collaborative teaching and research will also cross disciplinary boundaries;

- fabrication—a rethinking of graduate programs to promote the hands-on, creative approaches well described as “learning by doing” and “publishing as making.” Fabrication shifts the primary emphasis within graduate education from the cultivation of deep learning to high-level skills training. The addition of new situated learning, teaching, doing research, and fashioning research outcomes will open knowledge borne of the humanities to a range of constituencies and contribute to the applicability of humanities approaches and understanding to questions outside the humanities disciplines.

Publicity

“Publish or perish” is a dark reflection on the competitive academic marketplace. Those who publish, so goes the familiar narrative, get tenure, merit, and advancement; publications help them get jobs in the first place. But “publish or perish” is capable of a more generous and creative interpretation. Kant, as Michael Warner has pointed out, revolutionized the usual definition of the public person, making the public official a private person and the scholar a public person. What was the basis of Kant’s counterintuitive rethinking of privacy and publicity? Government officials have to follow the rules attached to their post; also, the size and character of their public is prescribed by their position and function. Their lack of real engagement with others means they are public in a weak sense only (like being out on the public street as a traffic cop is). The scholar is capable of making “public use of his own reason . . . before the entire public of the reading world.”²⁴ Since, on this account, the essential and constitutive practice of scholars is to engage with others in “the entire public of the reading world,” the failure to publish would cause them to cease to be what they are—scholars who did not publish would perish indeed.

One way to rethink graduate education is by way of this Kantian idea of the inherent public character of scholarship. We propose that students’ work should become more public and more oriented toward the world. Publicity confers a measure of relevance and permanence on the work students do. Their most accomplished research should be able to move beyond the seminar room and the library into a potentially innumerable readership and into a space of discourse oriented toward futurity. The work should, in principle, join with other work in ongoing conversations about matters of public concern.²⁵

Making doctoral research public will contribute to the well being of humanities students. Arendt tells us that we achieve our personhood by appearing before others in public: “In acting and speaking, men show who they are, reveal actively their unique personal identities and thus make their appearance in the human world.”²⁶ This kind of constitutive, dialogical self-disclosing speech

²⁴ Immanuel Kant, “An Answer to the Question, What is Enlightenment?” quoted in Michael Warner, *Publics and Counterpublics* (New York: Zone Books, 2002), 44.

²⁵ It might be objected that research on “Walt Whitman and the Erotics of War,” “Animals in Dutch Genre Painting,” or “Kantian Narratives of Knowledge” (these are made-up titles!) is hardly the kind of thing able to conjure a public readership or a high degree of public uptake, but that objection is based on an impoverished idea about what counts as public discourse. The theory of publics has taught us that public speech and public association are far more various and variegated than is usually thought. For more on the plurality of public life, see Warner, *Publics and Counterpublics*, and listen to “The Origins of the Modern Public,” Episodes 13 and 14, Ideas, CBC Radio, *iTunes Podcasts*. Web. 1 Sept. 2010. Note also that Kant doesn’t talk about everyone in the world but rather about “the entire public of the reading world.”

²⁶ Arendt, *Human Condition*, 178.

and action cannot take place exclusively in the private sphere of the classroom or the carrel; it requires the temporal and spatial extension of the public sphere.

Moreover, to encourage the making public of the work of PhD students is to recognize that they are emerging experts in their own right who should be developing a public voice and a public role of their own. They should not wait until after graduation to begin speaking to members of the academy and to the world beyond the university. A worldly reorientation of humanities education will also expand the kinds of careers that graduates think about entering and for which their graduate programs will prepare them and will be seen to prepare them.

Collaboration

Knowledge in the humanities is by its character the work of many hands. Even the great singular works of scholarship turn out upon examination to be nested within extended geographical and historical networks of inquiry, hypothesis, evidence gathering, analysis, and argument. Those kinds of examination do not diminish the greatness of achievements such as Erich Auerbach's *Mimesis* or Northrop Frye's *Anatomy of Criticism*, but they do correct an impression we might have had about their solitariness. While original contributions to knowledge should remain the standard for high-level humanities research (after all, we do not want to encourage mere restatements of familiar ideas or approaches), it nevertheless is valuable to foster collaborative teaching and research in new PhD programs.

The ability to collaborate and to take a leadership role in collaborative projects is equally valuable in the non-academic and academic workplaces. The 2013 NACE Employers survey rated "ability to work in a team structure" second on a list of ten workplace skills (just behind communication skills and just ahead of problem-solving and decision-making).²⁷ SSHRC, principal funder of humanities research in Canada, promotes large-scale collaborative, interdisciplinary research by way of its flagship funding programs.

Collaboration and publicity are potentially strong interactive attributes of humanities research. Important is how collaborative work opens up ways of making research public beyond the traditional avenues of journal-article and book publication. Collaborative, interdisciplinary research tends to ask larger, more multi-sided questions than does individual research. Big, new questions are likely to be of interest to journals and academic presses, and they are also likely to appeal to people outside the university and thereby to lead to exchanges between, on one side, humanities researchers and, on the other, students and teachers, community groups, reading clubs, government and non-governmental policy experts, and so on. Large-scale projects that push into new territory can have an altogether beneficial leveling effect, where the unprecedented research questions themselves call on the insight and learning of all and create an egalitarian atmosphere where students, postdoctoral fellows, and professors feel themselves to be partners in a shared enterprise.

²⁷ "The Skills and Qualities Employers Want in Their Class of 2013 Recruits," <http://www.nacweb.org/s10242012/skills-abilities-qualities-new-hires/>, accessed December 2 2013.

Fabrication

Humanities education can take place outside the seminar room and the library; PhD students can learn by undertaking internships (like their undergraduate brethren) or by doing studies in the field. They can do research in more creative and fabricative ways than has been the usual practice in the academy.

Translating humanities research processes and outcomes from their traditional archival and textual forms into performances, collaborative design charrettes, websites for exchange, argument, and publication of work-in-progress, video and audio recordings, and so on will open research and teaching to new perspectives and serve to welcome new audiences and participants to the work of the humanities.

All this is not to move away for a traditional humanities emphasis on deep, disinterested study and understanding (as opposed to instrumental kinds of inquiry, where researchers go no deeper and explore no more widely than is absolutely necessary in order to address a particular question); it is rather to expand how humanities understanding can act in the world and with others and how humanities research can take part in productive, public dialogue by way of different dissemination and publication forms and across a range of media platforms. These new ways of doing humanities will help train PhDs who are intellectually nimble, pedagogically sophisticated, conversant in digital modes, networks, archives, and subjectivities, flexible in their modes of address, energized by collaboration, and adept at telling the story about what they do. Reconceived along these lines, graduate education in the humanities will lead and will be seen to lead toward a range of different careers—in the academy, in education outside the university, in public policy and service, in publishing, in print and electronic media, in advertising, and so on.

What follows are two scenarios for re-envisioning the PhD. We offer them not as the only or the best solutions, but rather as a means of thinking through the possibilities for reimagining the traditions of doctoral study and for doing the work of 21st-century humanities scholarship differently.

The Workshop PhD

Students who enter the Workshop PhD do no prescribed course work, do not write candidacy exams, and do not produce book-length doctoral dissertations. They are welcomed as apprentices into an interdisciplinary research workshop led by a small group of faculty who have agreed to take a leadership role in the workshop for five years. The student selection process bears in mind the need to match the student cohort with the disciplinary training and areas of interest of the faculty leaders, but the workshop also calls on the expertise of other members of faculty so as to guarantee appropriate training and supervision for students. In the course of their program, which is four, maximum five, years from the start of apprenticeship to the achievement of mastery in their particular fields of study, the students complete four linked projects, all of which develop the students' key areas of research.

One of the projects is collaborative and one is interdisciplinary; collaboration and interdisciplinarity may be combined in one project. The collaborative project may be with a faculty workshop leader or with another student apprentice. The four required projects are variously oriented, with at least one designed for a non-academic constituency such as a policy

agency, a School Board, a broadcaster, a non-academic readership, high school students, and so on. Each project aims toward a form of publication—an essay in an academic journal, a long article in a public affairs or arts magazine, an interactive website, a documentary film or radio show, an innovative theatre or visual arts program, etc. The four projects progress from apprentice work to masterpiece. (A “masterpiece” is “a piece of work produced by a craftsman in order to be admitted to a guild as an acknowledged master”—*Oxford English Dictionary*.) The culminating single-authored masterpiece is the most ambitious and substantial of the four projects. Each project is assessed and judged by all the members of the workshop, students and faculty; the final standing of the first three projects—fail, pass, distinction—is determined by the faculty workshop leaders. The masterpiece is judged by a specially convened panel that includes the workshop leaders, faculty members from outside the workshop, and non-academic specialists (where appropriate). The adjudication panel also takes into account the first three projects and the overall coherence of the student’s work.

Given the project focus of the program, students are not required to take courses; however, they are free to enroll in courses or undertake other kinds of learning as is appropriate to the projects they are developing.

The students in the program will teach each other in the course of their work, but it is also important that they develop their teaching skills, which include planning (and the ability to change plans), presentation skills (both verbal and visual elements), listening, constructive critique and assessment of other people’s work, and the use of new technologies. This ensemble of skills is important inside and outside the academy. Students will undertake a supervised teaching assignment toward the end of their program.

As in traditional PhD programs, students are admitted on the strength of their accomplishment in particular fields of study, the level of their preparation for demanding, original research and writing, and the coherence of their research plan, which includes a description of the four proposed projects. They bring with them both a disciplinary focus and a particular line of approach that they aim to develop into a defined research question/focus.

Student A came to the Workshop PhD with a BA, Honours History, from the University of Guelph and an MA in Canadian History from the University of Toronto. Her Masters thesis developed a study of labour and race in the Canadian maritime provinces. Her proposed program of study for the PhD was a study of Africville, the Afro-Canadian community built up in the 19th century, encroached upon by the city of Halifax in the 20th century, and eventually broken up, the members of the community dispersed, by the municipal authorities. The four proposed projects included (1) an academic essay on Africville and work in the Atlantic fishery to be co-written with one of the workshop leaders, a leading scholar of race, labour, and 20th-century political activism; (2) an interdisciplinary study of law and employment policy in early 20th-century Nova Scotia with a focus on Africville, also intended for academic publication (Student A planned to take a course on Canadian labour law in order to prepare for project #2); (3) an online audio archive of stories about race and work in the Maritimes (with transcripts and tagging to enable online searching), the project to be undertaken in collaboration with a Halifax-based community group; and (4) a long essay, intended for a non-academic, well-educated readership, on the working lives of the Africville community.

In the event, Student A's program took an unanticipated turn. Another member of her cohort, a student with a Masters degree in Film Studies, was developing a project on the history of documentary film in the former Soviet Union. Student A recognized the considerable potential value of film and film studies for her work. Consequently, she replaced her planned project #2, the essay on law and employment policy, with a collaborative, interdisciplinary essay, co-written with her fellow student, on the representation of race in documentary film in Canada and Russia. Instead of the course on labour law, she took a senior undergraduate film history course that included a hands-on introduction to film-making. That led in turn to a shift (for project #3) from an audio to a video archive of stories about work and race. She had developed some digital archival skills in her MA program and was assisted in her new project by one of the DH experts in the university. Project #4 underwent the most radical transformation, from a lengthy published essay to the production of a documentary film about the creation, destruction, and rebirth of Africville, with a well-informed focus on labour, race, and the building of community. She also had the opportunity in Year 4 to co-teach a course on documentary film with the faculty member who had taught her the senior undergraduate film course.

Student A emerged from her PhD program (it took the full five years) with two collaborative academic publications (one published, one in press), a useful and used online video archive (fully transcribed and searchable) of first-hand stories on race and labour in Canada in the 20th century, and a 40-minute documentary film on Africville. Three months after graduation, she is on the job market: she has applied for several postdoctoral fellowships and to the three university positions in Canadian history being advertised this year. She is also preparing for her second job interview with Telefilm Canada.

PhD in Applied Humanities

The PhD in Applied Humanities offers students from a wide range of humanities disciplines training in the emerging scholarly field of public or applied humanities, matched with graduate-level training in social and cultural policy and arts and cultural management, and formative internship work, all of which culminate in a major project that combines humanities research with cultural policy and/or arts and cultural management. The program is led by teachers and supervisors from the Humanities, Social Sciences, and Management as well as by mentors from the worlds of business, public service, education, and the arts. The integration of humanities with other approaches results in research that addresses matters of contemporary concern with unusual historical, aesthetic, and theoretical depth.

The Applied Humanities PhD addresses the recognized need for humanities scholarship to engage more directly with society—with the artists, thinkers, policy-makers and managers who populate and animate the world of arts and ideas beyond the formal academy—and for training in the humanities to connect more concretely to real-world possibilities for employment after graduation. Part of this integration requires that cutting-edge intellectual work is shared with non-university organizations, and that those organizations are invited to participate in that work.

Students are admitted on the basis of their academic record, the level of their preparation for original, interdisciplinary research, and the coherence of their research plan, which includes a research description, a proposed internship site, and a program of research and publication.

As in the Workshop PhD, students in the Applied PhD develop their teaching skills by undertaking a supervised teaching assignment toward the end of their program.

The first year of the four-year program features intensive classroom work in policy and management studies. Students take specialist courses in these fields according to the emphasis of their proposed research project. They also take part in a full-year integrative seminar that focuses on how to connect humanities methodologies and kinds of knowledge with work in cultural policy and arts and cultural management and how to mobilize humanities research for application in the world.

Year 2 combines an extended internship (four or five months) at an agreed worksite such as the Musée des Beaux-Arts de Montreal, the Stratford Shakespeare Festival, Sid Lee (Commercial Creativity), the National Arts Centre, the Conference Board of Canada, the Toronto Public Library, or the Vancouver Symphony Orchestra. Support from MITACS makes it possible for these to be paid positions. Interns learn by working at their chosen site, and they also begin to assess where the principal challenges and opportunities lie for their chosen internship sponsor.

The second part of Year 2 sees students embarking on a double, interconnected research path. They develop a research proposal for the consideration of their chosen internship site, outlining what they see as a major challenge/opportunity. They also begin a more traditional humanities research project on the art form, public service, public education area, or commercial practice most pertinent to their internship organization. The goal of this stage of the work is to allow the two pathways (policy/management and humanities orientations) to develop independently but also to encourage the growth of numerous crossing points. Students in the cohort also meet to compare and confer on a bi-weekly basis during this building phase of their work.

Year 3 focuses mostly on the policy/management side of the research. Once students' projects have been approved by their internship site mentors and the faculty committee of the PhD program, students complete a short follow-up internship and then work on the policy/management research and the final report. The report is completed and presented to the internship organization and submitted to the Applied PhD program committee toward the end of Year 3. Students also seek to publish their work in an appropriate policy or management journal.

Students in Year 4 focus on their major research projects, which are substantial studies that integrate management/policy with humanities research on their chosen subject. Students draw on what they have learned in their first-year integrative seminar as well as on the double-path initial research undertaken in Year 2. It is to be expected that the highly interdisciplinary research developed by students in the program, their work being ahead of the academic community in general, will not easily find publication venues at the present moment. Students will have to use their creativity and energy to see their work into the public sphere.

Student B completed his BA in English at McGill with a concentration in Drama and Theatre. He earned an MFA in Theatre from the University of British Columbia. He also served as dramaturge for one production of Vancouver's Electric Theatre Company. He applied to the PhD in Applied

Humanities because he wanted to cultivate both his commitment to theatre practice and his love of the scholarly study of drama and theatre.

His proposed research project focused on how performance practices and theatre spaces can shape how people gather together in public space and how theatrical practices and actual theatre buildings can influence the numbers, gender, social class, and age range of audiences. His proposed research had a strongly historical dimension and drew in particular on early modern English theatre, especially Shakespeare's Globe. His proposed internship site was, appropriately enough, the Stratford Shakespeare Festival in Ontario.

He expected to focus on cultural policy and humanities from the outset of his program, but he soon realized that management studies might connect more productively with his humanities work going forward and with his key research questions. He focused on Marketing in Year 1 and worked productively on the crossover between Marketing and the social history of theatre. Year 2 led him not to the rehearsal room or the stage but rather to Advertising and Marketing at the Stratford Festival where he assisted the Festival's efforts to expand its audience and where he began a study of the demographics of the audience for classical theatre in Canada.

The study that followed in Year 3 developed an analysis of the audience, which tends to represent an older demographic—an especially serious concern for the Stratford Festival, a classical company at least two hours from the nearest large population centre. The study's recommendations focused on virtual rather than physical space and electronically mediated forms of association, the idea being to draw younger people interactively into how plays are put on, how lighting, staging, and costumes are designed, how actors prepare. Younger people who have had a hand, as it were, in the production of plays are more likely to want to see those plays performed. He mapped out how an interactive website could be developed and how it would appeal to young people, especially at Toronto high schools and colleges. A shorter and revised version of the study was submitted to the *American Journal of Arts Management*.

Student B was fortunate to teach a senior undergraduate course in the English Department on Shakespeare in the Fall of his fourth year in the program. His work in the course was mentored by a senior Shakespearean at the university. The course, on Shakespeare, theatre, and the market from Elizabethan England to the 21st century, helped greatly to crystallize his understanding and to shape his major research project, which combined a historical study of Shakespearean theatrical marketing with a management-oriented study (drawing on his report for the Stratford Festival) on best marketing practices for classical theatre in the 21st century. Two essays from his major project have been accepted for publication, one in *Shakespeare Studies* and another in the *Journal of Arts Administration and Policy*.

Now a year after graduation, Student B is working full-time for the Stratford Festival, developing the marketing/social media strategies he had outlined in his Stratford study. In his limited spare time, he is writing a book, provisionally titled "Theatre and the Marketplace."

5. Recommendations

1. Mentorship

The burden of the diversified PhD training that we are advocating cannot fall only to the student's supervisor or to his or her home department. There is, currently, very little support available to graduate students in the humanities interested in non-academic positions. University professors are best equipped to train future university professors, but it would be naïve to prescribe a revolution in PhD training that leaves the responsibility for diversified training solely to academic mentors. Instead, the transformation needs to be at the level of the institution itself, and it needs to be systemic. The research supervisor is an important and irreplaceable part of doctoral training. It is he or she who guides the discipline-specific development of the emerging scholar and who has the depth of knowledge and breadth of academic experience to assess the work as it develops. But the research supervisor should not be the student's only source of professional guidance. Universities should create dedicated professional planning and placement services that serve to broaden the legitimate employment expectations of humanities PhDs and that prepare graduates for a multiplicity of career opportunities.

2. The PhD Dissertation

By their nature, dissertations require students to narrow their research topic and to extend that research to book length. Dissertations normally take a number of years to research and write. If it is to continue as the centerpiece of the PhD, the dissertation must be reconceived so that it serves to develop a deep and a broad understanding of a subject and also fosters an ability to translate a discipline-based project into mobile, adaptable, and useful knowledge. We recommend a more radical change by replacing the thesis with a coherent ensemble of projects, which can include single-author and collaborative essays, electronic archives or other kinds of digital scholarly resources, editions, translations, works of scholarship in a range of forms and oriented toward multiple audiences, and so on.

3. Professionalization and Time to Completion

The time to completion for the humanities PhD is approximately seven years in Canada; in the USA, it is nine. There are a number of strong arguments concerning how the program's length can inhibit the transition to marriage and parenthood and how years of low income and high fees can leave new PhDs with mountains of debt. The central issue for us is not program length, starting a family, or student debt, important as these are. People make serious life choices, including significant sacrifices, in order to achieve what they believe are worthwhile goals. We are principally concerned that the PhD continues to be understood as somehow preparatory for one's real professional life, which can begin, it is widely assumed, only once new PhDs secure tenure-track jobs. We contend, however, that PhDs develop work experience, high-level skills, and scholarly professionalism during their years as doctoral candidates. We recommend that universities recognize and promote the professionalism of PhD candidates. We also recommend that PhD candidates recognize their own professionalism by cultivating a more purposeful approach to their programs, understand that the PhD is a step in a larger career narrative, and complete the degree in a timely way. In light of already mentioned arguments about family and debt, the fact that

one of the best indicators of success in the academic job market is timely completion of the PhD, and the need to treat the PhD as professional training, we recommend that doctoral programs be four and no more than five years.

4. **New Scholarly Technologies**

We need to set a higher standard of digital literacy for humanities programs in recognition that graduates will be seeking employment in an information age. The digital humanities offer a potentially useful way of balancing the strengths of the humanities with the development of new, worthwhile, and marketable competencies. Rather than create an entirely independent (and siloed) program in digital humanities, it is preferable to integrate the digital humanities into humanities graduate programs.

5. **Recruitment**

A PhD designed to lead to both non-academic and academic career paths will have the potential to attract new sorts of candidates for whom advanced study and intellectual development are appealing and valuable but whose primary career goals are not necessarily inside the academy. Such PhD candidates might bring valuable professional experience to their doctoral research. To this end, we should expand the criteria by which candidates are admitted to PhD programs, considering skills, achievements, and career goals as well as past academic performance.

6. **The Labour Market and the Culture of the Academy**

Faculty, students, and administrators must take in the facts about the prospects for academic employment of PhDs and must begin discussions across the academy about how to redress the situation. We have focused in this white paper on the humanities, but the situation is also challenging in other fields of study. We have argued that the way forward is by changing PhD programs, reorienting them toward the world in multiple ways; we have catalogued our priorities and outlined two new model programs. It is most important, however, to encourage open, critical, creative dialogue that leads to newly conceived graduate programs and that begins the long-term task of transforming the culture of the academic institution of the humanities.

7. **Reporting**

We recommend that the leading academic/humanities organizations in Canada (AUCC, CAGS, CAUT, SSHRC, the Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences, and U15) publish an agreement to the effect that all doctoral programs must keep up-to-date records, at a minimum, about recruitment of PhD students, years to completion, attrition rates, and a full accounting of placement inside and outside the academy—three, five, and ten years after graduation or after withdrawal from programs. We recognize the difficulty and expense of gathering information from students after graduation or withdrawal, but that information will be indispensable for assessing the value of new programs and for developing a full defense of the social value of the humanities on the basis of evidence about the work done by those educated by the most advanced humanities programs in the country.

The members of the SSHRC Knowledge Synthesis project on *The Future of Graduate Training in the Humanities*

Robert Barsky, Professor of French and Comparative Literature; Director, Bandy Center, Vanderbilt University

Jay Clayton, William R. Kenan, Jr. Professor of English; Director, Curb Center for Art, Enterprise, and Public Policy, Vanderbilt University

Lesley Cormack, Professor of History; Dean of Arts, University of Alberta

Rebecca Duclos, Dean of Graduate Studies, School of the Art Institute, Chicago

Geoffrey Harpham, Director, National Humanities Center (USA)

Michael Jemtrud, Associate Professor of Architecture, McGill

Martin Kreiswirth, Professor of English; Associate Provost and Dean, Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies, McGill

Bronwen Low, Associate Professor of Education, McGill

Christopher Manfredi, Professor of Political Science; Dean of Arts, McGill

Paulina Mickiewicz, PhD in Art History and Communication Studies, McGill

Stéfan Sinclair, Associate Professor of Digital Humanities, Languages, Literatures, and Cultures, McGill

Sidonie Smith, Mary Fair Croushore Professor of the Humanities; Director, Institute for the Humanities, University of Michigan

Paul Yachnin, Tomlinson Professor of Shakespeare Studies; Director, Institute for the Public Life of Arts and Ideas, McGill

Leigh Yetter, Executive Director, Institute for the Public Life of Arts and Ideas, McGill

We thank the following for their critical engagement with our work, generous provision of valuable information, and good counsel:

- Carl Amrhein, Provost, University of Alberta; Visiting Executive, Conference Board of Canada
- Nathalie Bondil, Directrice, Musée des beaux-arts, Montréal
- Mary Chapman, Associate Professor of English, University of British Columbia
- Cameron Charlebois, President, GPMC, Inc.
- Manon Gauthier, former CEO, Segal Centre for Performing Arts, Montréal; Conseillère de la Ville Verdun
- Becky Lentz, Assistant Professor, Department of Art History and Communication Studies, McGill
- Herb O’Heron, Director of Research and Policy, Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada
- Anthony Paré, Professor of Education, McGill
- Jacob Rabas, PhD Candidate, Department of Political Science, McGill
- Dorothee Schreiber, Administrator, International Masters for Health Leadership, Desautels Faculty of Management, McGill